



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 08/980,645 | 12/01/97 | SMITH | TRAK02222 |

THOMAS W HUMPHREY
WOOD HERRON EVANS
2700 CAREW TOWER
CINCINNATI OH 45202

PM51/0622

| EXAMINER |
|------------|
| ZANELLI, M |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 3661 | 20 |

DATE MAILED: 06/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO. |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

20

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) T. Humphrey (Reg # 34,353) (3) _____
(2) M. Zaneli, Pri. ExR. (4) _____

Date of interview 6/21/01

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 47

Identification of prior art discussed: Leonard (GB 2 261 977 A)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed claim 47

relative to Leonard. Did not agree on interpretation of Leonard as it
pertains to dispatching function without human intervention. Discussed
amending claims to further define how database is reviewed and the manner
of scheduling services, such as time codes. No agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☐ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner's Signature